

SAN ILEFONSO AND MONITORING DATA
9-14-11

*The situation was described as a "radiation emergency" that required special radiation monitors.

*EPA Superfund was told by State of New Mexico they had a specialized MOU/MOA with all 19 Pueblos that had all things in place ie, points of contact, access agreement etc. Was told the state was "adamant" about this.

*Two types of radiation monitoring occurred during the Las Conchas Fire - Fly over, like at Laguna and stationary monitoring.

*San I had stationary monitors

*Since it was an emergency situation and the State (NM) was adamant about the MOU/MOA they had in place, EPA followed the State's procedures, and assumed data information sharing was part of the agreements.

*EPA did not publish any data. It was handed over to the State.

*It was explained to me that specialized KSA's are needed to interpret radiation data. If one does not know what they are reading/interpreting, the wrong message could be sent out.

EXAMPLE: Potassium 40 is naturally released when trees are burnt. While radioactive. it is not harmful due to tree burning.

*I called Neil (Weber) at San I and left a message with him. Was going to ask if he had a copy of the MOU/MOA mentioned during my meeting with Superfund.

*In an earlier discussion with Mr. Weber, he stated he did want to make a "Federal Case out of this" and was appreciative of EPA's assistance. He also said EPA personnel were professional and courteous.

**Side Note: EPA's MOA/MOU with Laguna does address data sharing.